



PUBLIC COMMENT FORM

Cascade County Planning Department
121 4th St N, Suite 2H-2I Great Falls, MT 59401
Phone: 406-454-6905 | Fax: 406-454-6919
Email: planningcomments@casadecountymt.gov

Instructions:

This form is for providing public comment to the Cascade County Planning Department for review by any one or more of the following review and/or approval boards: Zoning Board of Adjustment (ZBOA), Planning Board, or Board of County Commissioners. Only complete submissions will be included for board review. Please provide the relevant information for each section below. A complete submission provides all of the following: commenter name and address, comment subject, and commentary on the subject issue(s). If additional space is needed for commentary, please attach additional sheets to this form. Completed forms may be submitted in person at the Planning Department's office or by email at planningcomments@casadecountymt.gov.

Commenter Information:

Name: Karen Carlson

Complete Address: 346 Stockett Road, Sand Coulee, MT 59472

Comment Subject (please check one):

- ☐ Special Use Permit Application ☐ Subdivision ☒ Zoning Text and/or Map Amendment
☐ Growth Policy ☐ Variance ☐ Floodplain Regulation Amendment
☐ Subdivision Regulation Amendment ☐ County Road Abandonment/ Discontinuation of County Street
☐ Other (describe): _____

Comment:

I am in support of the Planning Board's recommendation to not have Mixed Use 40 and keep the land designated Agriculture. After the many meetings and discussions, the Board of County Commisioners should accept their recommendation. The Planning Board has done their due dilligence to come to this conclusion. This would protect and maintain Cascade County's rural character and community's historic relationship with natural resourse development. We need to protect our most productive soils from both development and erosion. Future development should locate to non-productive or marginally productive agriculture land. All changes must meet MCA 76-1-102. The welfare of citizens should be considered regarding public health, public safety and welfare. Adequate provision of transportation, water, and sewage should be a factor in future development, along with conserving the value of properties already established.

Respectfully submitted: 10-27-2020

For Office Use Only

Date Received:		Date Reviewed:		Complete:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
----------------	--	----------------	--	-----------	------------------------------	-----------------------------

Date Received:		Date Reviewed:		Complete:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
----------------	--	----------------	--	-----------	------------------------------	-----------------------------

To: Cascade Board of County Commissioners

From: Kathleen McMahon, AICP

Date: 10-27-20

RE: Public Hearing Comments – Zoning Ordinance Revisions

The following comments are submitted on behalf of the Montanans for Responsible Land Use regarding the proposed zoning text and map amendments. MFRLU supports the Planning Board recommendation to DENY creation of the proposed “Mixed Use 40 (MU-40) and RETAIN the Agricultural District. This memo summarizes findings based on comments previously submitted to the Planning Board.

1. According to an analysis of written public comments, 62 individuals expressed opposition to the MU-40 District. Only one person expressed support of the MU-40 district.
2. Agriculture is the overwhelming land use in the area shown as “Agricultural” zoning. According to the Montana Natural Heritage Program, more than 96% of the area in the “Agricultural District” is classified as “Cultivated crops, pasture/hay, prairie/grassland, and Forest/woodland”. This finding supports the Planning Board recommendation to deny the MU-40 District and retain the Agricultural District.
3. “Large scale intensive” uses as proposed in the MU-40 District should be denied because such uses are not consistent with the following Growth Policy goals and policies to preserve prime farm land and the County’s rural character.:
 - Goal 2: Protect and maintain Cascade County’s rural character and the community’s historic relationship with natural resource development.
 - Goal 5: Preserve and enhance the rural, friendly and independent lifestyle currently enjoyed by Cascade County citizens.
 - Goal 9: Foster the heritage of the area in agriculture and forestry in recognition of their economic contribution and the intrinsic natural beauty of grazing areas, farmlands and forests.
 - Goal 11: Protect and maintain Cascade County’s rural character, encourage efficient use of land.
 - Policy 8.3: Prime Agricultural Soil Area: The prime agriculture soils resource preservation areas are intended to contain those soil areas where it is necessary and desirable, (because of their high quality, availability of water, and/or highly productive agricultural and grazing capability), to preserve, promote, maintain and enhance the use of such areas for agricultural purposes and to protect such land from encroachment by non-agricultural uses, structures or activities. Therefore, the prime agricultural soil preservation areas of Cascade County are those areas where the soils have been classified by the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), according to the NRCS definition of prime farmland or farmland of statewide importance.
4. According to maps in the Growth Policy based on the NRCS soil survey, prime farmland is located throughout the county. To protect this prime farm land, the MU-40 district should be denied and the Agricultural District retained per the recommendations of the Planning Board.
5. In March, 2019 the Planning Department prepared a map for the public hearing on the zoning revisions to depict the pattern of “location conformance permits” that have been issued in the County. An analysis of this map indicates that in the are proposed for the MU-40 District, less than 20 permits are

for commercial/industrial uses. Calculations indicate that these parcels, represent **less than one percent** of parcels in the proposed MU-40 district. Clearly, the **prevailing** existing land use in the proposed MU-40 District is overwhelmingly “Agricultural” and “Rural residential”. Hence, the existing “Agricultural” zoning is most consistent with existing land use patterns and rural character of the district. This finding supports the Planning Board recommendation to deny the MU-40 District and retain the Agricultural District.

6. According to the Growth Policy, the existing agricultural district includes varied landscapes such as mountains, floodplains, canyons, cropland, pasture and open space. The Growth Policy describes potential hazardous features throughout the district such as flooding, erosion, landslide, soil creep and earthquake faults. Allowing the large scale, intensive uses in such areas without a conditional use review would result in such uses being located in areas with hazardous features that are not suitable for development and could result in significant public health and safety concerns. This finding supports the Planning Board recommendation to deny the MU-40 District and retain the Agricultural District.
7. There is not adequate transportation infrastructure to support the large scale intensive mixed uses that are proposed in the MU-40 District. Many of the roads in the proposed MU-40 District are either gravel roads or narrow paved roads with a subbase that is not designed for high volume traffic or heavy loads. While agricultural machinery is transported on county roads, this equipment operates on a seasonal basis and traffic volumes are low. Large-scale intensive manufacturing uses, however, typically generate high volume, year-round truck traffic, for continuous deliveries and transport of goods throughout the day. If such an operation locates on roads that lack capacity for heavy loads or high traffic volumes, there can be significant fiscal impact to county residents to upgrade and maintain roads located in these rural areas. Traffic related to such uses can also increase the risk for serious health and safety concerns related to traffic accidents. Furthermore, the uses proposed in the MU-40 District are not consistent with the following goal from the Growth Policy.

“Goal 6: Promote and maintain a transportation system that provides safety, efficiency, and cost efficiency.”

This finding supports the Planning Board recommendation to deny the MU-40 District and retain the Agricultural District.

8. There are not adequate emergency services to support large scale intensive manufacturing businesses in the proposed MU-40 District. The Cascade County Pre-Disaster Mitigation Plan identifies a “high risk” for hazardous material spills associated industrial uses. Furthermore, the Community Wildfire Protection Plan indicates the risk of wildfire in the County as high. There are significant response times in remote rural areas that are located throughout a county with over 1 million acres. Locating large scale, intensive uses in these remote areas will increase the risks for loss of life and property due to hazardous materials spills, industrial accidents and wildfires. The county should be discouraging the location of such uses in remote rural areas. This finding supports the Planning Board recommendation to deny the MU-40 District and retain the Agricultural District.

In consideration of these findings, MFRLU strongly urges to the County Commission to follow the Planning Board recommendations and adopt the zoning amendments as published for the public hearing.



PUBLIC COMMENT FORM

Cascade County Planning Department
121 4th St N, Suite 2H-2I Great Falls, MT 59401
Phone: 406-454-6905 | Fax: 406-454-6919
Email: planningcomments@cascadecountymt.gov

Instructions:

This form is for providing public comment to the Cascade County Planning Department for review by any one or more of the following review and/or approval boards: Zoning Board of Adjustment (ZBOA), Planning Board, or Board of County Commissioners. Only complete submissions will be included for board review. Please provide the relevant information for each section below. A complete submission provides all of the following: commenter name and address, comment subject, and commentary on the subject issue(s). If additional space is needed for commentary, please attach additional sheets to this form. Completed forms may be submitted in person at the Planning Department's office or by email at planningcomments@cascadecountymt.gov.

Commenter Information:

Name: Brian Neilsen

Complete Address: 13 Homestake Lane Great Falls, MT 59405

Comment Subject (please check one):

- ☐ Special Use Permit Application ☐ Subdivision ☒ Zoning Text and/or Map Amendment
☐ Growth Policy ☐ Variance ☐ Floodplain Regulation Amendment
☐ Subdivision Regulation Amendment ☐ County Road Abandonment/ Discontinuation of County Street
☐ Other (describe): _____

Comment:

I object to the counties zoning changes reflected in MU-40, not just the "MU-40" name. The MU-40 zoning would allow prime farmland that contain excellent soils to be used for large scale industrial uses. I would like to see the current agricultural zoning maintained so as not to lose our prime farmland for crop production, grazing and maintain traditonal agricultural use in Cascade county, MT. Removing any Special Use Permits for large scale intensive uses is will allow industrial agriculture and would contadict the growth policy.

Thank you for your consideration,

For Office Use Only

Date Received:		Date Reviewed:		Complete:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
----------------	--	----------------	--	-----------	------------------------------	-----------------------------

Yonker, Charity N.

From: Yonker, Charity N.
Sent: Wednesday, November 4, 2020 4:20 PM
To: Larson, James; Jon Voden; Weber, Jane; Briggs, Joe
Subject: RE: New Zoning for Medical Marijuana

Thank you for forwarding! I will add this to the public comments.

Charity N. Yonker
Planning Director
Cascade County Planning Department
121 4th Street North, Suite 2H/I
Great Falls, MT 59401
Phone: (406) 454-6905, Ext. #6336
Fax: (406) 454-6919
[Planning Department Website](#)

Disclosure: This email is public information subject to public records disclosure laws which has been created or received on an electronic mail system in the course of county business and includes any electronic record attachment(s), unless otherwise protected from disclosure under the laws of the State.

From: Larson, James <jlarson@cascadecountymt.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, November 4, 2020 4:17 PM
To: Jon Voden <support@rmr-mt-420.com>; Weber, Jane <jweber@cascadecountymt.gov>; Briggs, Joe <jbriggs@cascadecountymt.gov>
Cc: Yonker, Charity <cyonker@cascadecountymt.gov>
Subject: RE: New Zoning for Medical Marijuana

Ms. Paul,
Thank you for your email today. The County Commission is to hold a public hearing on Nov. 12, 2020, at 5:30pm on this subject. It will be a ZOOM virtual meeting. The commission has held a couple of work sessions with the planning dept. in order to get all the information that is pertinent to this topic. Look on the County Website to join the meeting.
Thanks again,
Jim

From: Jon Voden <support@rmr-mt-420.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 4, 2020 3:09 PM
To: Weber, Jane <jweber@cascadecountymt.gov>; Larson, James <jlarson@cascadecountymt.gov>; Briggs, Joe <jbriggs@cascadecountymt.gov>
Subject: New Zoning for Medical Marijuana
Importance: Low

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Commissioners

I would just like to address concerns about the proposed zoning changes for the medical marijuana industry. My husband and I own an interest in a Medical Marijuana Dispensary And Grow. We are located at 4725 22nd Avenue North. We wanted to do everything legal and by the book, which we did. The whole process including a COSA rewrite, costs us thousands of dollars and time, including building a dispensary.

I think it is especially important now that recreational marijuana has been voted in in the State of Montana that these Zoning laws are kept in effect, it would be horribly unfair for all the dispensaries following the rules and being in their proper zoning if other new dispensaries could be closer to the city limits henceforth where we are all located in the outskirts of town or the "boonies" as our patients call it. We would not be able to compete. Especially with Out of State corporations coming into the state when the recreational marijuana goes into full force it will put the Montana Small Business Dispensary out of business. Please think about this as you make your final decisions on Zoning changes. Thanks for your time.

Respectfully

Shauna Paul

Rocky Mountain Remedies

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

Yonker, Charity N.

From: Linda Metzger <legm7481@msn.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 4, 2020 6:32 PM
To: Planning Comments
Subject: Nov. 12 Public Hearing on Zoning Regs

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear County Officials:

I concur with the Planning Board's September 2019 recommendations.

"Mixed Use" can become "Hodge Podge." Our agricultural lands are too precious to risk this.

I'm particularly concerned about the public's right to transparency on proposed large-scale projects; therefore, Special Use Permits must continue to be required for them.

Linda Metzger
32 Windy Ridge Ln
Great Falls MT 59404

Yonker, Charity N.

From: Carolyn Craven <lifeisgood4us@xmailpost.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 5, 2020 11:49 AM
To: Planning Comments
Subject: Public Comments
Attachments: 00 Public Comment Form - CKC 11.03.20.pdf; 11.03.20 Resubmission of 03.12.19 Public Comments Zoning & GP.pdf; 11.04.20 Resubmission of 03.21.19 Public Comments.Zoning Changes.pdf

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Greetings,

Attached are public comments submitted in 2019 for the Planning Department. I am resubmitting to be certain the Commissioners will hopefully read them.

Cordially,

Carolyn K. Craven
Great Falls, MT

Date Received:		Date Reviewed:		Complete:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
----------------	--	----------------	--	-----------	--

Carolyn K. Craven
101 14th Avenue South
Great Falls, MT 59405

March 12, 2019

PUBLIC COMMENTS ON CASCADE COUNTY PROPOSED CHANGES

Excerpts From **CASCADE COUNTY GROWTH PLAN**

GOAL #1 Sustain & strengthen the economic being of Cascade County Citizens.

- B. Stabilize and diversify the county's tax base by encouraging the sustainable use of its natural resources.
- C. Identify and pursue primary business development that complements existing business, which is compatible with communities and utilizes valuable assets. Identify and pursue targeted business development opportunities to include, but not limited to, manufacturing/heavy industry, telecommunications and youth/social services.
- D. Promote the development of cultural resources and tourism to broaden Cascade County's economic base.

One of the above goals is "primary business development that complements existing business, which is compatible with communities...". Before proposing any zoning changes, did anyone ask the "public" – the citizens of our communities and rural areas in the county what our visions would be?

The tourism we have would likely decline with these proposed zoning regulations. The types of industries being promoted in these mixed use zoning districts are not in alignment with the sustainable use of natural resources, development of cultural resources, and tourism.

GOAL #2 Protect & maintain Cascade County's rural character and the historic relationship with natural resource development

- A. Foster the continuance of agriculture & forestry in recognition of their economic contribution and the intrinsic natural beauty of grazing areas, farmlands and forests
- B. Preserve Cascade County's scenic beauty and conserve its forests, rangelands and streams, with their abundant wildlife and good fisheries.
- C. Preserve Cascade County's open space setting by encouraging new development to locate near existing towns and rural settlements and by discouraging poorly designed land subdivisions and commercial development.
- D. Assure clean air, clean water, a healthful environment and good community appearance.

Many of the proposed zoning changes have revolved around animal production including feedlots, slaughterhouses, rendering plants, butcher shops, etc. These and some other heavy industries, including refineries, do not “preserve the intrinsic natural beauty of grazing areas, farmlands and forests”, and they do not “preserve the scenic beauty and conserve rangelands and streams with their abundant wildlife and good fisheries”. They also do not “assure clean air, clean water, a healthful environment and good community appearance.

The United Nations’ four-hundred page report, “Livestock’s Long Shadow” and other research studies confirm that livestock production is in the “top three environmental contributors, leading to environmental problems, including increased greenhouse gas emissions, land degradation, water pollution, and increased health problems”.

GOAL #3 Maintain agriculture economy.

- A. Protect the most productive soil types.
- B. Continue to protect soils against erosion.
- C. Protect the floodplain from non-agricultural development

These proposed changes allow heavy industries to use our most productive soils, with possible outcomes of overuse and erosion.

GOAL #5 Preserve and enhance the rural, friendly and independent lifestyle currently enjoyed by Cascade County Citizens

These increased industries throughout the county in mixed use areas are not preserving “the rural, friendly and independent lifestyle enjoyed by Cascade County Citizens”, which includes clean water, clean air, open spaces and communities that are culturally rich, friendly and welcoming.

GOAL #8 WATER QUALITY: Protect surface & groundwater quality from pollution.

These proposed zoning changes do not thoughtfully provide any protection for our pure water, prime farming land, clean air and incredible water resources. Reviews of large animal production industries reveal dead zones, polluted water, irreparable land damage, and toxic air. Increasing heavy industrial uses seems like a 19th century approach to future growth and environmental stewardship.

GOAL #9 WORKING LANDSCAPES: Foster the heritage of the area in agriculture and forestry in recognition of their economic contribution and the intrinsic natural beauty of grazing areas, farmlands and forests.

“The heritage of the area in agriculture....and the intrinsic natural beauty of grazing areas and farmlands...” speak about maintaining environmentally friendly, smaller sustainable farms, thereby preserving the intrinsic beauty of natural grazing areas and farmlands. Smaller sustainable farms typically are in harmony with the environment. Interestingly, the 2014 Growth Policy also states “every effort should be made to protect and maintain farming units, because the family farm is important in the economy of Cascade County”.

Concentrated animal feeding, slaughter operations, and ancillary industries historically pollute land, water and air and irreparably alter and destroy the intrinsic natural beauty of grazing areas and farmlands. (per numerous peer-reviewed published research articles).

The goals in the 2014 Growth Policy were originally adopted in 1982 and most recently affirmed in 2006 and 2014. As stated by our county leadership, “These goals continue to provide the best overall direction for county planning.”

GROWTH POLICY-CHAPTER 5- ECONOMIC CONDITIONS

FINDINGS

- ❖ The “family farm” is Cascade County’s predominate form of agricultural operation.
- ❖ The trend toward farm consolidation is slowing. Recent studies suggest the return after taxes of a 1,200 acre and a 1,500 acre wheat farm to be about the same per acre.
- ❖ There appears to be sufficient capital for present farming units to increase their size of operation.

ECONOMIC ACTIVITY AND CONSTRAINTS

1. Commercial and manufacturing uses should be encouraged, if such uses do not adversely affect agriculture and are located around and in existing rural communities.
2. Every effort should be made to protect and maintain farming units, because the family farm is important in the economy of Cascade County.
4. Efforts should be made to discourage commercial strip development along major thoroughfares.

5. Efforts should be made to stabilize and develop employment and economic activity.
6. Environmental as well as economic perspectives should be considered in any future development.
7. Efforts should be made to attract non-transportation sensitive industry to Cascade County.
8. Utilization of locally produced agricultural products and raw materials should be encouraged.
11. Encourage future development to locate on non-productive or marginally productive agricultural land.
12. Minimize, to the greatest degree possible, the adverse social and environmental impacts of development and encourage beneficial effects of orderly growth.
13. Encourage economic activities to locate in those areas most economically, socially and environmentally appropriate, as determined by the County Planning Board and other public agencies.

- 1) Recommend the Planning Board & Planners revisit these well stated goals directly above.**
- 2) Recommend the Planning Board & Planners access information about the deleterious effects of these large animal production industries on the environment and on the social fabric of communities.**
- 3) Recommend the public be invited to participate in the process of the Growth Policy and then new Proposed Zoning Changes.**

The following excerpts are from extensive peer-reviewed research I have read on the topic of large scale animal processing.

A 2008 Pew Commission report concluded: “Economically speaking, studies over the past 50 years demonstrate that the encroachments of industrialized agriculture operations upon rural communities result in lower relative incomes for certain segments of the community and greater income inequality and poverty, a less active “Main Street,” decreased retail trade, and fewer stores in the community.”

A 2006 study commissioned by the State of North Dakota Attorney General’s Office reviewed 56 socioeconomic studies documenting the economic impacts of industrial agriculture in general on rural communities. The studies consistently “found detrimental effects of industrialized farming on many indicators of community quality of life, particularly those involving the social fabric of communities.” [28] The only kinds of economic development attracted to “industrial agricultural communities” are other environmentally polluting and socially degrading industries. **This is not sustainable economic development; it is industrial economic exploitation.**

Respectfully submitted,



Carolyn K. Craven
101 14th Avenue South
Great Falls, MT 59405

Carolyn K. Craven
101 14th Avenue South
Great Falls, MT 59405

March 21, 2019

PUBLIC COMMENTS ON CASCADE COUNTY PROPOSED ZONING CHANGES

PLANNING BOARD STAFF REPORT 03.26.19

PLANNING DEPT GROWTH PLAN GOALS REFERENCED IN STAFF REPORT 3.26.19

Goal 1 Objective A (9)

Stimulate the retention and expansion of existing businesses, new businesses, wholesale and retail businesses, and industries including agriculture, mining, manufacturing/processing and forest products.

Goal 2 Objective A (1)

"Economic contribution and intrinsic natural beauty of grazing areas, farmlands, forests"

Objective C (1)

Foster the continuance of agriculture and forestry in recognition of their economic contribution and the intrinsic natural beauty of grazing areas, farmlands and forests.

Goal 3 Objective A (2)

Protect the most productive soil types.

Objective B (1)

Protect soils against erosion

Goal 5 Objective A (1)

Maintain Cascade County's citizens independent lifestyle and minimize local governmental intervention, to the extent possible, consistent with the requirements of a continually evolving economy and constantly changing population.

Objective D (1)

Encourage the continued development of educational programs and facilities, recreational opportunities and spaces and health services for all county residents.

Goal 9 Objective F (1)

Encourage open buffers between rural residences and adjoining agricultural lands.

Goal 10 Objective B (2)

Encourage subdivision designs that do not restrict wildlife movement and preserve important wildlife habitat and corridors.

Goal 11 Objective A (4)

Preserve the county's open space setting by encouraging cluster development.

Goal 12 Objective A (1)

Work to maintain an adequate land supply for diversity of all housing opportunities,

Objective B (1)

Consider the locational needs of various types of housing with regard to proximity of employment, and access to transportation and services.

Objective F (1)

Encourage group homes, foster care facilities, and facilities for other special populations are equitably distributed throughout the county, yet near daily services.

PD=Planning Department Staff Report in Draft Document 3.26.19

GOAL 1 SUSTAIN & STRENGTHEN THE ECONOMIC WELL-BEING OF CASCADE COUNTY CITIZENS (10 OBJECTIVES)

- PD Changes 7.5.9 Mixed Use Permitted Principal Uses
 - Goal 1, Objective A "Stimulate retention & expansion of businesses..."
 - Added "Butcher Shop, Convenience Sales, Alcohol Distillery, Wild Game Processing"
 - 1 Moved "Vehicle Repair & Casino" from Permitted Principal Use to Special Use
- PD Changes 7.5.10 Mixed Use Accessory Uses On Same Lot w/Principal Use
 - Goal 1 Objective A "Stimulate retention & expansion of businesses..."
- PD Changes 7.5.11 Mixed Use Permitted Uses w/SUP
 - Added, "Garage, Private, Federal Firearms Retailers/Dealers, Event Center, Multi-Family Dwelling, Large Contractor Yard"
 - Goal 1, Objective A "Stimulate retention & expansion of businesses..."
 - Goal 12, Objective B "Location needs of housing & proximity of employment..."
- PD Changes 7.6.10 Mixed Use 20 Permitted Accessory Uses on Same Lot w/Principal Use
 - Goal 1, Objective A "Stimulate retention & expansion of businesses..."
- PD Changes 7.7.10 Mixed Use 40 Permitted Accessory Uses on Same Lot w/Principal Use
 - Goal 1, Objective A "Stimulate retention & expansion of businesses..."
- PD Changes 7.10.10 Commercial District Permitted Accessory Use on Same Lot w/PU
 - Goal 1, Objective A "Stimulate retention & /expansion of businesses..."
- PD Changes 7.10.11 Commercial District Permitted Uses Upon Issuance of SUP
 - Goal 1, Objective A "Stimulate retention & expansion of businesses..."
- PD Changes 7.12.2(2) Light Industrial (I-1) Permitted Principal Uses=Industrial
 - Goal 1, Objective A "Stimulate retention & expansion of businesses..."
 - Added "Value-Added Commodity Processing Facility" as allowed use
- **PD Agriculture District Rezone Justification**
 - Goal 1, Objective A "Stimulate retention & expansion of businesses..."

GOAL 2 PROTECT & MAINTAIN CASCADE COUNTY'S RURAL CHARACTER & THE COMMUNITY'S HISTORIC RELATIONSHIP WITH NATURAL RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT (6 OBJECTIVES)

- PD Changes 7.11.1 Industrial Requirements/Area Requirements/Minimum Lot Areas For Each District (RR-SR1-SR2-UR-MU20/MU40)
 - Goal 2, Objective C "Preserve open space setting"
- PD Changes 8.2.5.2 Electric Fencing
 - Goal 2, Objective A "Intrinsic natural beauty of grazing areas, farmlands, forests"

GOAL 3 MAINTAIN AGRICULTURAL ECONOMY (4 OBJECTIVES)

- PD Changes 7.6.2 Mixed Use 20 & 7.7.2 Mixed Use 40 Minimum Lot Size
 - Goal 3, Objective A "Protect the most productive soil types"
 - Goal 11, Objective A "Preserve the county's open space setting..."
- PD Changes 7.6.6 & 7.7.6 Lot Coverage
 - Goal 3, Objective A "Protect the most productive soil types"
 - Goal 11, Objective A "Preserve the county's open space setting..."

C.K. Craven 03.21.19

Homeowner, Great Falls

- PD Changes 8.18.2.5 Parking Lot Paving
 - Goal 3, Objective B “Protect soils against erosion”

GOAL 4 RETAIN THE PRESENCE OF THE US MILITARY IN CASCADE COUNTY (4 OBJECTIVES)

GOAL 5 PRESERVE & ENHANCE THE RURAL, FRIENDLY & INDEPENDENT LIFESTYLE CURRENTLY ENJOYED BY CASCADE COUNTY CITIZENS (4 OBJECTIVES)

- PD Changes 7.2.4 (7) Rural Residential/Uses Permitted w/SUP
 - Goal 5, Objective D “Encourage...health services for all county residents”
 - Goal 12, Objective F “Encourage group homes...”
- Added “community residential center with nine occupants or more” as a special use
- **PD Agriculture District Rezone Justification**
 - Goal 5, Objective A “Maintain Cascade County’s citizens independent lifestyle....”

GOAL 6 PROMOTE & MAINTAIN A TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM THAT PROVIDES SAFETY, EFFICIENCY & IS COST EFFECTIVE (9 OBJECTIVES)

NO REFERENCES BY PLANNING DEPARTMENT FOR THIS GOAL

GOAL 7 MINIMIZE RISK OF FIRE BY MANAGEMENT & PLANNING & TO PERMIT THE EFFECTIVE & EFFICIENT SUPPRESSION OF FIRES IN ORDER TO PROTECT PERSONS, PROPERTY & FORESTED AREAS (8 OBJECTIVES)

NO REFERENCES BY PLANNING DEPARTMENT FOR THIS GOAL

GOAL 8 PROTECT SURFACE & GROUNDWATER QUALITY FROM POLLUTION (9 OBJECTIVES)-

NO REFERENCES BY PLANNING DEPARTMENT FOR THIS GOAL

GOAL 9 FOSTER THE HERITAGE OF THE AREA IN AGRICULTURE & FORESTRY IN RECOGNITION OF THEIR ECONOMIC CONTRIBUTION & THE INTRINSIC NATURAL BEAUTY OF GRAZING AREAS, FARMLANDS & FORESTS (8 OBJECTIVES)

- **PD Agriculture District Rezone Justification**
 - Goal 9, Objective F “Encourage open buffers between rural...& agricultural”

GOAL 10 MINIMIZE IMPACT TO WILDLIFE & FISHERIES (4 OBJECTIVES)

- PD Changes 7.6.2 & 7.7.2 Mixed Use 20 & 7.7.2 Mixed Use 40 Minimum Lot Size
 - Goal 10, Objective B “Subdivision designs to...preserve wildlife habitats”
- PD Changes 7.6.6 & 7.7.6 Lot Coverage
 - Goal 10, Objective B “Subdivision designs to...preserve wildlife habitats”

GOAL 11 PROTECT & MAINTAIN CASCADE COUNTY'S RURAL CHARACTER, ENCOURAGE EFFICIENT USE OF LAND (8 OBJECTIVES)

The reference below is about "Lot Width"

- PD Changes 7.1.1.3 Residential District Requirements/Area Requirements/Lot Width...
 - Goal 11, Objective A "Preserve the county's open space..."
- **PD Agriculture District Rezone Justification**
 - Goal 11, Objective A "Preserve the county's open space..."

GOAL 12 SUPPORT EFFORT TO ENSURE RESIDENTS OF CASCADE COUNTY HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY TO OBTAIN SAFE & AFFORDABLE HOUSING (10 OBJECTIVES)

- PD Changes 7.1.3.2 Residential District Requirements/Area Requirements/Front Yard
 - Goal 12, Objective A "Maintain adequate land...for housing..."

GOAL 13 PROTECT AREAS NEAR MISSILE SITES FROM ENCROACHMENT & INCOMPATIBLE DEVELOPMENT (12 OBJECTIVES)

APPENDIX 2: AGRICULTURAL DISTRICT REZONE JUSTIFICATION

"Staff finds that the following goals are served by the proposed split of the Agricultural District into MU-20 and MU-40:"

Goal 1, Objective A: Retention & expansion of business...

Goal 5, Objective A: Maintain independent lifestyle...

Goal 9, Objective F: Encourage open buffers...

Goal 11, Objective A: Preserve open space...

PLANNING DEPT STAFF REPORT

03.26.19

GROWTH POLICY GOALS USED

USED 8 GOALS

USED 13 DIFFERENT OBJECTIVES

OUT OF 96 POSSIBLE OBJECTIVES

SO USED ONLY 13% OF POSSIBLE OBJECTIVES

USED #1/A 9x

USED #3/A 2x

USED #11/A 4x

USED #10/B 2x

USED #2/A, #2/C, #3/B, #5/A, #5/D, #9/F, #12/A, #12/B, #12/F – 1x Each

OF THE 13 DIFFERENT OBJECTIVES, USED 1 (9x), 1 (4x), 2 (2x), 9 (1x)

9 ARE FROM #1/A “SUSTAIN & STRENGTHEN ECONOMIC WELL-BEING”

4 ARE FROM #11/A “OPEN SPACE...ENCOURAGE CLUSTER DEVELOPMENT”

SO...

**THESE 2 OBJECTIVES ACCOUNT FOR 13 REFERENCES OUT OF A
TOTAL OF 26 REFERENCES TO OBJECTIVES IN THE PLANNING REPORT**

50% (13/26) OF PLANNING DEPT REFERENCES CAME FROM ONLY 2 OBJECTIVES 1/A & 11/A

(Some Objectives Used Multiple Times, Some One Time, as per above)

The PD used 26 references from 13 different objectives.

So 13 different objectives used with 96 possible = 13.5% of possible objectives used.

65% (17/26) of references from only 4 different objectives = 4.2% of the 96 possible objectives.

50% of references from only 2 objectives = 2.1% of possible objectives

**100% OF PROPOSED ZONING CHANGES ARE BASED
ON ONLY 13% (13/96) OF GROWTH POLICY OBJECTIVES**

THERE IS NO MENTION OF GOALS ABOUT TRANSPORTATION,
WATER QUALITY, CLEAN AIR, ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY,
TOURISM, PRESERVING CASCADE COUNTY’S SCENIC BEAUTY...

ALSO, THERE IS NO RATIONALE FOR THE NEW ADDITIONS OF “BUTCHER SHOP”, “ANIMAL FEEDING OPERATION (AFO)”, “VALUE-ADDED COMMODITY PRODUCT”, “VALUE-ADDED COMMODITY PROCESSING”, “WORKFORCE HOUSING”, AND NO RATIONALE FOR DEFINITION CHANGES IN “COMMERCIAL FEEDLOT” OR “INDUSTRIAL” USES.

THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT USED ONLY **4 OBJECTIVES** (PRIMARILY BUSINESS/ECONOMIC (#1A, #5A, #9F, #11A) OUT OF THE **96** TOTAL OBJECTIVES (**4.2%**) OF THE POSSIBLE OBJECTIVES) IN THE 2014 GROWTH POLICY

TO JUSTIFY CHANGING
CURRENTLY ZONED AGRICULTURAL LAND TO
INDUSTRIAL MU-20 AND MU-40

THERE WERE **NO REFERENCES** TO TRANSPORTATION; PROTECTING SURFACE AND GROUNDWATER FROM POLLUTION; PROTECT AND PROMOTE CASCADE COUNTY'S RICH CULTURAL HERITAGE; PROMOTE THE DEVELOPMENT OF CULTURAL RESOURCES AND TOURISM TO BROADEN CASCADE COUNTY'S ECONOMIC BASE; PRESERVE CASCADE COUNTY'S SCENIC BEAUTY AND CONSERVE ITS FORESTS, RANGELANDS AND STREAMS, WITH THEIR ABUNDANT WILDLIFE AND GOOD FISHERIES; ASSURE CLEAN AIR, CLEAN WATER, A HEALTHFUL ENVIRONMENT, AND GOOD COMMUNITY APPEARANCE; AMONG OTHERS.

It appears the above references to the Growth Policy in the Planning Department Staff Report for 03.26.19 were "after the fact", as there were no references to the Growth Policy in the initial Proposed Zoning Changes. These references were in a document apparently created after initial public comments were received and in anticipation of the March 26 meeting, if I understood the response to my query correctly. They do not appear to reflect a thoughtful rationale based on all of the goals and objectives in the 2014 Cascade County Growth Policy.

If these references to the Growth Policy were part of the process for proposed zoning changes, please clarify why they were not included at the time of releasing that document. Thank you!

Thank you for your consideration of these comments and recommendations.

Respectfully submitted,



Carolyn K. Craven
101 14th Avenue South
Great Falls, MT 59405

C.K. Craven 03.21.19
Homeowner, Great Falls



PUBLIC COMMENT FORM

Cascade County Planning Department
121 4th St N, Suite 2H-2I Great Falls, MT 59401
Phone: 406-454-6905 | Fax: 406-454-6919
Email: planningcomments@cascadecountymt.gov

Instructions:

This form is for providing public comment to the Cascade County Planning Department for review by any one or more of the following review and/or approval boards: Zoning Board of Adjustment (ZBOA), Planning Board, or Board of County Commissioners. Only complete submissions will be included for board review. Please provide the relevant information for each section below. A complete submission provides all of the following: commenter name and address, comment subject, and commentary on the subject issue(s). If additional space is needed for commentary, please attach additional sheets to this form. Completed forms may be submitted in person at the Planning Department's office or by email at planningcomments@cascadecountymt.gov.

Commenter Information:

Name: Erin Tingey

Complete Address: 8359 US Hwy 89 Great Falls, MT 59405

Comment Subject (please check one):

- ☐ Special Use Permit Application ☐ Subdivision ☒ Zoning Text and/or Map Amendment
☐ Growth Policy ☐ Variance ☐ Floodplain Regulation Amendment
☐ Subdivision Regulation Amendment ☐ County Road Abandonment/ Discontinuation of County Street
☐ Other (describe): _____

Comment:

I agree with the Planning Board's recommendation to deny the proposal of Sub-Section 7.7 "Mixed Use 40 District." The Planning Board is meant to be a reflection of the citizens of the county. The Planning Board By-Laws state "The purpose of the Board shall be to ensure the promotion of public health, safety, morals, convenience and order of the general welfare and for the sake of efficiency and economy in the process of community development." It further states the Board has jurisdiction to "encourage the proper use of land, and Provide healthy surroundings for family life in rural and residential areas." They recommended a denial of the MU-40 District, and to keep the current Agricultural District. The zoning changes proposed in the MU-40 would allow for large scale industrial use; uses that would generate toxic waste, pollution, high traffic volume and other such repercussions while destroying prime soils and farmland. Most definitely not providing a "healthy surrounding for family life in rural and residential areas." Also, I object to the removal of the need for a Special Use Permit for large-scale intensive uses. That process is designed to allow for transparency in the process of a large-scale use which will affect surrounding land owners, some of which are families. They should be openly accountable to what they are doing, how they are doing it, and how it will impact those around them. If it will create pollution, smell, noise, traffic, devaluation of surrounding property, those issues should allow for public comment and input and evaluation as they will have a very public impact.

For Office Use Only

Date Received:		Date Reviewed:		Complete:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
----------------	--	----------------	--	-----------	------------------------------	-----------------------------

Yonker, Charity N.

From: Logan Tinsen <logantinsen@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 5, 2020 3:47 PM
To: Planning Comments
Subject: public comment
Attachments: Public-Comment-Form.pdf; public comment 11_5_2020.docx

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

To Whom it May Concern:
Please find attached public comment.

Thank you,

Logan Tinsen Pharm.D.



PUBLIC COMMENT FORM

Cascade County Planning Department
121 4th St N, Suite 2H-2I Great Falls, MT 59401
Phone: 406-454-6905 | Fax: 406-454-6919
Email: planningcomments@cascadecountymt.gov

Instructions:

This form is for providing public comment to the Cascade County Planning Department for review by any one or more of the following review and/or approval boards: Zoning Board of Adjustment (ZBOA), Planning Board, or Board of County Commissioners. Only complete submissions will be included for board review. Please provide the relevant information for each section below. A complete submission provides all of the following: commenter name and address, comment subject, and commentary on the subject issue(s). If additional space is needed for commentary, please attach additional sheets to this form. Completed forms may be submitted in person at the Planning Department's office or by email at planningcomments@cascadecountymt.gov.

Commenter Information:

Name: Kathleen McMahon

Complete Address: 151 Wedgewood Ln., Whitefish, MT 59937

Comment Subject (please check one):

- ☐ Special Use Permit Application ☐ Subdivision ☒ Zoning Text and/or Map Amendment
☐ Growth Policy ☐ Variance ☐ Floodplain Regulation Amendment
☐ Subdivision Regulation Amendment ☐ County Road Abandonment/ Discontinuation of County Street
☐ Other (describe): _____

Comment:

I am a professional land use consultant and have prepared these comments on behalf of Montanans For Responsible Land Use (MRFLU). MRFLU supports the Planning Board recommendation to deny the MU-40 District and retain the Agricultural District. The attached public comments contain findings to support this recommendation.

MRFLU urges the BOCC to adopted the amended zoning revisions as published for this public hearing to reflect the Planning Board motion.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

For Office Use Only

Date Received:		Date Reviewed:		Complete:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
----------------	--	----------------	--	-----------	------------------------------	-----------------------------

I am a young professional, that is born and raised in Cascade County. I have chosen to stay and now raise my family here. I want to make it clear I support the Planning Board recommendation to deny the MU-40 District and retain the Agricultural district. I do not care what you call it, but the principal in what is already outlined in the Agricultural district is what matters. Most importantly the retention of the special use requirement for "Value added agricultural commodity processing facility. This may include processing, manufacturing, storage and the like." This allows the public to provide valued input on concerns for development in this District. Much of the land in this area has been identified by the state as farmland of high importance. To maintain our agricultural heritage, it is important we protect these lands to unwise, unnecessary development that is better suited for a different District. I believe it would also behoove the BOCC to await the 2020 census before making many changes to the planning districts. This would allow the proper evaluation of the current Cascade County demographics and update the growth policy to help guide changes to Zoning Ordinances within Cascade County. Thank you four your consideration of these comments.

Best,

Logan Tinsen Pharm.D.

Yonker, Charity N.

From: Christine <mesh1000@msn.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 5, 2020 5:45 PM
To: Planning Comments
Subject: Madison food park/ slaughter house

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Please stop this. The changes in the zoning should have been voted on by the citizens!

Shame on you for allowing this to happen.

I have gone to the meetings .

You can count on when a new base closure list comes up and they are next to a slaughter house..... Not rocket science there!!!!

Sent from my iPhone

Yonker, Charity N.

From: Carolyn Craven <lifeisgood4us@xmailpost.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 5, 2020 9:53 PM
To: Planning Comments
Subject: Public Comment
Attachments: 00 Public Comment Form - CKC #7.pdf; 11.05.20 Public Comments AG-MU40 Zoning.pdf

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Greetings,

Attached is a public comment on AG VS MU40.

Cordially,

Carolyn K. Craven
Homeowner

Date Received:		Date Reviewed:		Complete:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
----------------	--	----------------	--	-----------	------------------------------	-----------------------------

PUBLIC COMMENTS ON AGRICULTURAL VS MU40 ZONING

❖ Planning Board Recommendations AG District

- The Planning Board (PB) was very clear in their recommendations to retain the Agricultural District.
 - Agricultural use is defined as “the use of land for crop production, animal production, aquaculture, apiculture, entoculture, or forestry”.
- “Maintain the agricultural economy” is one of the five overarching goals in the Growth Policy.
- Most of the land in the Agricultural District is used for crop production, grazing, grasslands and woodlands.

CC COMMENT: **Recommend retaining clearly identified zoning for a separate Agricultural District encompassing as much prime farmland for crop production and grazing as is available.**

❖ Planning Department Recommendations MU40

- Intent: The MU-40 District is intended to provide for mixed land uses that may be more intensive in character and larger in scale while allowing residential sites characteristic of traditional farming and ranching uses.
- Planning Department Staff Justification
 - Per the staff document *Appendix2: Agricultural District Rezone Justification*, “The boundaries for the proposed MU-20 and MU-40 district were determined by using a geospatial statistical tool for determining spatial autocorrelation based on feature locations (parcels in the Agricultural District) and attribute values (parcel size). Spatial autocorrelation is a tool for looking at how well spatial objects correlate with other nearby objects over an area. In this case, planning staff wanted to identify areas within the Agricultural District which were characterized by higher concentrations of small parcels on the assumption that these areas suggested residential land use. The results of this geospatial analysis can be viewed in Map 1. The results of the analysis provided the basis for the boundaries of the proposed MU-20 and MU-40 Districts by assigning the two districts to a combination cluster or outlier group.”

CC COMMENT: The above staff justification for Agricultural zoning change using a geospatial statistical tool did not seem to identify prime farmland, productive soils, grazing and crop production lands nor did it justify the removal of the formal Agricultural District. It did not inform the reader about the actual current uses of the land (*i.e. “...it identified areas within the Ag District which were characterized by concentrations of small parcels on the assumption that these areas suggested residential land use”*).

CC COMMENT: MU40 does not consider the location of prime farmland and would allow large-scale intensive industrial activities on prime agricultural land.

- Staff chose the following “Relevant Growth Policy Goals and Objectives” to justify the Agricultural division into MU20 and MU40.
 - Goal 1: Sustain and strengthen the economic well-being of Cascade County’s citizens. Objective A: Stimulate the retention and expansion of existing businesses, new businesses, value-added businesses, wholesale and retail businesses, and industries including agriculture, mining, manufacturing/ processing and forest products.
 - Goal 5 (A): Preserve and enhance the rural, friendly and independent lifestyle currently enjoyed by Cascade County’s citizens. Maintain Cascade County’s citizens independent lifestyle and minimize local governmental intervention, to the extent possible, consistent with the requirements of a continually evolving economy and constantly changing population.
 - Goal 9(F): Foster the heritage of the area in agriculture and forestry in recognition of their economic contribution and the intrinsic natural beauty of grazing areas, farmlands, and forests. Encourage open buffers between rural residences and adjoining agricultural lands.
 - Goal 11(A): Protect and maintain Cascade County’s rural character, encourage efficient use of land. Preserve the county’s open space setting by encouraging cluster development.

CC COMMENT: The goals chosen above focused on strengthening the economic well-being (Goal 1A), independent lifestyle (Goal 5A), economic contribution and open buffers (Goal 9F) and preserve open space with cluster development (Goal 11).

There was no mention of protecting prime soils and agricultural land for crops and grazing. Remember also from the first page of this document that “Maintain the agricultural economy” is one of the five overarching goals in the Growth Policy.

CC COMMENT:

The following relevant goals were not considered: Foster agriculture (Goal 2), protect the most productive soil types and protect against erosion (Goal 3A), assure clean air and water (Goal 2D) and preserve and protect prime agricultural soils and protect from encroachment by non-agricultural uses or activities (8.3).

- Goal 2 (C1): Foster the continuance of agriculture and forestry in recognition of their economic contribution and the intrinsic natural beauty of grazing areas, farmlands and forests.
- Goal 2 (D): Assure clean air, clean water, a healthful environment and good community appearance.
- Goal 3 (A2 & B(1)): Maintain agricultural economy, protect the most productive soil types, protect soils against erosion
- 8.3 PRIME AGRICULTURAL SOILS AREA
The prime agriculture soils resource preservation areas are intended to contain those soil areas where it is necessary and desirable, (because of their high quality, availability of water, and/or highly productive agricultural and grazing capability), *to preserve, promote, maintain and enhance the use of such areas for agricultural purposes and to protect such land from encroachment by non-agricultural uses, structures or activities.* Therefore, the prime agricultural soil preservation areas of Cascade County are those areas where the soils have been classified by the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), according to the NRCS definition of prime farmland or farmland of statewide importance.

- The Planning Department states that “MU40 reduced permitting barriers to agricultural and related uses (Agricultural Commodity Storage Facility, Value Added Agricultural Commodity Processing Facility, Veterinary Clinic, Guest Ranch)”.
- The Planning Department adds that “some productive land uses allowed through an approved SUP in the Agricultural district are proposed to be permitted principal uses in the MU-40 districts. For example, value-added agricultural commodity processing facilities, wild-game processing facilities, agricultural commodity storage facilities, and other uses are allowed as permitted principal uses. With the Agricultural district divided between the MU-20 and MU-40 geographies there is less of a need for the use of the SUP process since there are fewer potentially impacted residences and those around are likely to be involved in a productive land use.

CC COMMENT: The rationale above for “less of a need for the use of a SUP since there are fewer potentially impacted residences and those around are likely to be involved in a productive land use” is not justified for many reasons, including the unknown variables and potential adverse effects of an undefined process for a non-specific Value-Added Agricultural Commodity Processing Facility.

CC COMMENT: I have reviewed the Special Use Permits in the proposed MU40 Zoning and appreciate the extra SUPs required for large complexes (i.e. two separate SUPs for SH & Commercial Feedlot etc.). I noted a single inconsistency with Value-Added Agricultural Commodity Processing Facility (VACPF) in MU40. The VACPF requires a Special Use Permit in MU20.

Per the following definition, there is a lack of specificity of what the product might be, what possible chemicals might be used, how waste would be handled and what possible water use might be, etc. These types of non-specific unusual uses typically require additional oversight via a Special Use Permit which allows public participation in the process of reviewing and assessing the potential impacts.

Value-Added Commodity Processing Facility

Definition: Any facility in which one or more agricultural commodities are physically processed in such a way that results in a value-added agricultural product and is not otherwise defined in these regulations.

A Value-Added Agricultural Commodity Processing Facility does appropriately require a Special Use Permit in MU20. The unknown and potential adverse effects of a non-specific product processing facility on a much larger and remote site in MU40 must also require a Special Use Permit.

I urge the Planning Department to correct this oversight and add the requirement of a Special Use Permit to a Value-Added Commodity Processing Facility in MU40.

Respectfully submitted,



Carolyn K. Craven
Homeowner
Great Falls, MT 59405

Yonker, Charity N.

From: joy stender <joystender@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 5, 2020 11:15 PM
To: Planning Comments
Subject: Public Comment / Zoning Regulation Revisions
Attachments: PUBCOM ZONREG.pdf

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Attached please find public comment submitted in reference to the proposed CC Zoning Regulation Revisions.

Thank you,
Joy Stender



PUBLIC COMMENT FORM

Cascade County Planning Department
121 4th St N, Suite 2H-2I Great Falls, MT 59401
Phone: 406-454-6905 | Fax: 406-454-6919
Email: planningcomments@casadecountymt.gov

Instructions:

This form is for providing public comment to the Cascade County Planning Department for review by any one or more of the following review and/or approval boards: Zoning Board of Adjustment (ZBOA), Planning Board, or Board of County Commissioners. Only complete submissions will be included for board review. Please provide the relevant information for each section below. A complete submission provides all of the following: commenter name and address, comment subject, and commentary on the subject issue(s). If additional space is needed for commentary, please attach additional sheets to this form. Completed forms may be submitted in person at the Planning Department's office or by email at planningcomments@casadecountymt.gov.

Commenter Information:

Name: Joy Stender

Complete Address: 4612 12th Avenue South, Great Falls, MT 59405

Comment Subject (please check one):

- ☐ Special Use Permit Application ☐ Subdivision ☐ Zoning Text and/or Map Amendment
☐ Growth Policy ☐ Variance ☐ Floodplain Regulation Amendment
☐ Subdivision Regulation Amendment ☐ County Road Abandonment/ Discontinuation of County Street
☒ Other (describe): Proposed Revisions to CC Zoning Regulations

Comment:

RE: MU40 Permitted Principal Use #18 - "Value Added Agricultural Commodity Processing Facility..."

The potential for so many different, and currently undefined, types of facilities under this permitted use
raises numerous health and safety concerns, such as proximity to fire fighting and emergency services,
waste disposal, water usage, adequate transportation routes, etc. Without more specificity as to the nature of
these facilities, the use should not be allowed by right, but rather be subject to the special use permit process.

For Office Use Only

Date Received:		Date Reviewed:		Complete:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
----------------	--	----------------	--	-----------	------------------------------	-----------------------------